

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 13, 26, and 33 are amended. The amendments to claims 1, 13, 26, and 33 only clarify that the adapters are part of the common bus. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 1, 13, 26, and 33 are non-narrowing. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Chau in the November 8, 2005 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9, 13-22, 26-29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Tenfelde et al. (Tenfelde), U.S. Patent No. 5,873,307, and under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Salgado, U.S. Patent No. 5,579,087. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter of claims 10-12 and 23-25.

As agreed at the interview, none of the applied references disclose a common bus that comprises adapters, as recited in claims 1, 13, 26, and 33. For example, Tenfelde does not disclose that the adapters are part of the common bus (Fig. 1). Similarly, Salgado does not disclose that the adapters are part of the common bus (Fig. 1). Thus, as agreed at the interview, neither Tenfelde nor Salgado disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 1, 13, 26, and 33.

Because neither Tenfelde nor Salgado anticipate or suggest the features of claims 1, 13, 26, and 33, the applied references cannot possibly anticipate or suggest the subject matter of claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1, the subject matter of claims 14-22, which depend from claim 13, and the subject matter of claims 27-29, which depend from claim 26, for the

reasons discussed with respect to claims 1, 13, and 26, as well as for the additional features recited therein. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Salgado in view of Pepin et al. (Pepin), U.S. Patent No. 6,151,131. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed in the interview, Pepin fails to overcome the deficiencies of Salgado as applied to claim 26. Thus, the combination of Salgado and Pepin does not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 26.

Because neither of the applied references, nor a permissible combination thereof, discloses or suggests all the features recited in claim 26, the applied combination cannot possibly render obvious the subject matter of claims 30 and 32, which depend from claim 26, for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 26, as well as for the additional features recited therein. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

Thus, as agreed at the interview, the pending claims are patentable over the applied references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-33 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy  
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/tea

Date: December 7, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--